

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include most of the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 has been cancelled. Claim 7 was indicated as having allowable subject matter. It now follows that dependent claims 2 and 3, previously rejected, are now allowable. Claims 4 - 8 were also indicated as being allowable.

Claim 37 is newly presented and is dependent from claim 1. Claim 37 includes a limitation from cancelled claim 7 not included in amended claim 1.

Claim 38 is also newly presented. It is also dependent from claim 1. Claim 38 adds the limitation of a strut across the open area of each blade. This feature is neither taught nor suggested in the art of record.

Claim 9 has not been amended. The final limitation of claim 9 recites "a retainer nut threadedly engaging the arrowhead and having a tapering portion disposed against the tapering rear edge of the blades for locking the blades to the arrowhead." Adams '180 has been cited as meeting that limitation. However, a close examination of the Adams '180 patent shows that cited element 19 is not a retainer nut as assumed by the Examiner. Rather, the element 19 is simply an assembly collar, with two embodiments illustrated in Fig.8, a relatively light weight element and a relatively heavier element. The purpose of the element is simply to add the desired amount of weight to the arrowhead. Note that the element 19 is not threaded, but rather is held in place by the o-ring 21 and the arrow

shaft insert 15 by its threaded engagement with the stud 12. See Fig. 2 and column 2 lines 16 - 37.

The structure of claim 9 is clearly different from the Adams '180 structure. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 9 defines over the art of record and is allowable.

Dependent claims 10 - 17 were indicated as allowable in the Office Action mailed 03/09/04, and accordingly no further comments are deemed necessary in regard to them.

Independent claim 18 and its dependent claims 19 - 25 have been cancelled.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 28, as corrected. Claim 28 had an error, with the term "parallel" being incorrect; the term "perpendicular" should have been in the claim. Claim 26 as amended is now correct. Claim 26 and its dependent claims read on the embodiment of Figs. 15, 15A, and 16, 16A. There is no structure in the art of record comparable to the structure described in the specification and as claimed in independent claim 26 and its dependent claims 27 and 29.

Claim 27 remains as originally presented, and claim 28 has been cancelled.

Claim 29 has been amended to be dependent from claim 27.

Independent claim 30 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 31.

Claim 31 was indicated as allowable. Claim 31 has been cancelled.

Claim 32 has also been cancelled. The subject matter of claim 32 is now found in newly presented independent claim 39, along with the limitations of original claim 30.


Claim 33 has been amended to make it dependent from claim 38.

Claims 34, 35, and 36 remain as originally presented.

The art of record has been carefully considered, along with the very complete Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now in the application are allowable and an indication of such allowability is respectfully urged. If the Examiner would prefer language other than that found in the claims, it is requested that the undersigned attorney of record be called in order to expedite the allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

LARRY R. WATKINS et al, Applicants

By 

H. Gordon Shields,
Attorney of Record

HGS:jg
Enclosures
Phoenix, Arizona
(602) 997-4979